



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REVIEWS

The Pronunciation of Latin and Greek: the sounds and accents.

By E. H. Sturtevant, formerly Assistant Professor of Classical Philology in Columbia University. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois. 1920. Pp. xiii + 225.

Seelmann's *Aussprache des Latein* dates from 1885, and the third edition of Blass's similar book on Greek pronunciation from 1888. It was high time that the student of the classical languages should be able to find the best results of modern scholarship on these themes in a convenient compass; he now has it. The reviewer is particularly glad that the English-speaking student finds "the evidence in the case" accessible without the barrier of foreign language and style; for matters of pronunciation are of vital importance to every student, however elementary his acquaintance with the languages in question may be destined to be.

Professor STURTEVANT's book has five chapters: The Nature and Value of the Evidence; The Latin Sounds; The Greek Sounds; The Greek Accent; The Latin Accent. One most commendable feature of the book is that all passages quoted from Greek and Roman authors as evidence for the sounds or accents, are presented in English translation at the foot of the page,—a feature for which every one who has struggled with the crabbed style and awkward diction of the grammatical writers will be more than grateful.

So thorough is the reviewer's agreement with Professor Sturtevant, that he differs from him in only one major point—the nature of the Latin accent. He agrees with Professor Abbott that from about 100 B. C. to nearly 400 A. D. the educated Roman spoke with a pitch accent and the uneducated Roman with a stress accent; Professor Sturtevant holds, with English and German scholars, that through this period also Latin was spoken with a stress accent, though not a very strong one. Space forbids adequate discussion here; those interested are referred to pages 206-18 of the book under review for the one side of the question, and to Professor Abbott's article in CP. ii. 444-460 (also to a forthcoming article by the reviewer in TAPA. li) for the other.

Professor STURTEVANT's interpretation of the confused and confusing accounts which the ancient grammarians give of the pronunciation of *l* in Latin, is especially illuminating (pp. 78-81); so also his handling of final *m* (pp. 83-87), and of Greek *γ* nasal (pp. 168-169). One should note that the author of the book has done much original work in the determination of the

pronunciation of the languages; students who do not know this already will find evidence of this in the bibliographical footnotes where the activity of many American scholars is given due recognition.

Misprints, the almost inevitable blemish of every book, are very few, and those which do occur are mostly innocuous. An occasional misleading misprint, and some items of varying natures, may be listed in the order of occurrence. P. 44: One misses a reference to Mather, *Harv. Stud. in Class. Phil.* vi, 83-151. P. 47: the macron in *māior* etc. is awkward, though the text supplies the needed correction. P. 51: here and elsewhere, inscriptional forms might have been cited in capitals, in the conventional manner. P. 93: the restriction of the macron to use where absolutely obligatory, is unfortunate; it is peculiarly baffling on this page, where the loss of *s* before certain consonants is discussed, and *ebibo*, *tredecim*, *digero* are printed without any indication of long quantities. In line 10 of the same page, it will startle most readers to find *i* listed with *d g l m* etc. as a voiced consonant, even though he remember the terminology "consonantal I" found on p. 44. Pp. 100-101: the interpretation of the C-G problem of the Latin alphabet is excellent, and constitutes an advance on previous discussions; but a reference to Hempl, *TAPA*. xxx. 24-41, is desirable. P. 102. 5: read *Sergius* for *Serguis*. P. 107. 22: read *angens* for *angepes*. P. 108, and p. 110: Carnoy, *TAPA*. xlvii. 145-152, is cited, but his results are not fully utilized. Pp. 114-117: the discussion of *x* and *z* seems too brief for adequacy. P. 151, at bottom: the argument is not clear. What proves the length of *-ai* in the dative singular of the first declension? Or else, what proves its diphthongal nature? P. 152: the argument on subjunctive vowels is askew, because *λύεις λύει* contain not the lengthened *ε*, as Professor Sturtevant says, but the true diphthong (Brugmann-Thumb, *Griech. Gram.*<sup>4</sup> § 414. 1, § 415. 1). P. 154: the reviewer agrees with Professor Sturtevant that the use of *β* for *ϕ* in glosses and late inscriptions is no proof of a spirant pronunciation of *ϕ*, but attributes it to a spirant pronunciation of *β*, which is not very unlike the semivowel *ϕ*, rather than to a mere similarity in form of the two letters. P. 163. 19: The second consonant of *Ἑλιδαβερ* should be *σ*. Pp. 165-166: The probability that *ρ* was voiceless after *π τ κ* is stated in an unsatisfactory and unconvincing manner. Pp. 164-167: the term "whispered" *ρ* and *λ* may be a concession to non-technicality, but "voiceless" would be better, as showing the relation to the variations of other sounds; a remark that *ρ* and *λ*, uttered in a whisper, are voiceless, would make everything clear. There is a considerable body of evidence for voicelessness of *μ* and *ν* in some positions, but no mention is made of it. Pp. 175. 22: read *κῆθων* for *κῖθων*. P. 207: *undecim* is from *\*unum-decem* by haplology, rather than from *\*unodecem* by syncope.

But these matters are trifles, and are here presented merely to enable the user of the book to make his own corrections readily. No serious or semi-serious student of Latin or of Greek can afford not to avail himself of the interesting and helpful material here presented in readily digestible form. Much less should any teacher neglect it.

ROLAND G. KENT.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Virgilian Studies. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1920. The Growth of the Aeneid. By M. M. CRUMP. 124 pp. 6s. The Sixth Book of the Aeneid. By H. E. BUTLER. 288 pp. 12s.

These are the latest volumes to appear in Blackwell's series of "Virgilian Studies" to which Warde Fowler contributed his three brilliant essays on the Aeneid.

Miss CRUMP argues a thesis which has been argued before, though not so persuasively, and which probably can be neither proved nor disproved. As all students of Vergil know, the poet left his epic incomplete at his death. By an examination of the portions that are or appear to be unfinished, by studying the inconsistencies due to the lack of the final hand, and by using certain obscure statements of the Scholiasts, scholars like Conrads, Sabbadini, Heinze and Gercke have attempted to ferret out the poet's method of work and the original order of the books of the Aeneid. In reading the ingenious and often extravagant combinations of Gercke, one often feels that one is being worried with an intricate but insoluble puzzle, which leads through much useless literary gossip to no results of aesthetic or historical value. Miss CRUMP's book does not give that impression, for while it adds little that is new to the argument, it is characterized by good sense, revealing keen and sound literary judgment which provides the reader with valuable points of interpretation.

Miss CRUMP is chiefly concerned with developing a suggestion of Sabbadini that the present third book was originally written in the third person to stand at the opening of the epic. This was then followed by a second book which contained the games (now in the fifth book) played at Sicily immediately after Anchises' death, and a third book which described the arrival at Carthage. The argument, which is very enticing, cannot be reviewed here. Probably those who have recently read the second chapter of Heinze's "Epische Technik" will still feel that